



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,734	09/30/2003	Alan G. Smith	TI-36353	3980

23494 7590 04/02/2007
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

PHAM, CHRYSTINE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,734

Applicant(s)

SMITH

Examiner

Chrystine Pham

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendments filed on January 10, 2007. Claims 1, 5 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to limitation "first and second table" recited in claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See Peart (US 7117243 B2) as applied below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peart (US 7117243 B2) in view of Moore et al. of record (US 5696975, "Moore").

Claim 1

Peart teaches a computer system having application programs stored on remote memory module (see at least *server node, application program, executable programs* col.20:4-27) comprising:

Art Unit: 2192

a computer system (see at least *client system* col.2:42-65) having a first data type table that stores application and file type associations (see at least *executable program, mapping, type of data file* col.2:42-64; *database, application-related information, file types associated with application, client node* col.6:42-60; col.20:46-60);

at least one remote memory module (see at least *servers* col.22:15-34) that can be connected to the computer system such that storage locations on the module become accessible to the computer system (see at least *mappings, executable programs, client node* col.22:15-34; *application programs, application servers, client node* col.7:14-56; col.14:32-42; col.14:57-65);

an application program stored on the remote memory module (see at least *application programs, application servers* col.7:14-56; *application database 48, server, application-related information* col.13:63-col.14:1);

a second data type table stored on the remote memory module (see at least col.6:42-60; *file-type association, storage device* col.20:46-60; col.22:55-64);

a system computer software routine to combine the first and second data type table to form a virtual extension table that is used to determine which application is to be used for a given file type (see at least *received mapping, executable program, type of data file* col.2:42-64; *Program Neighborhood application, application-related information, application servers, data types, file types* col.6:42-60; col.14:59-65; *TABLE 3, File type, Executable program* col.22:15-34).

Art Unit: 2192

Peart does not expressly disclose said remote memory/storage module as a “removable” memory/storage module.

However, Moore discloses a computer system having application programs stored on removable storage (see at least 124, 126 FIG.6A & associated text); at least one removable memory module that can be inserted into the computer system such that the storage locations on the module become assessable to the computer system (see at least 112, 116, 118, 122, 120 FIG.6A & associated text); an application program stored on the removable memory module (see at least 124, 126 FIG.6A & associated text).

Peart and Moore are analogous art because they are both directed to execution/launching of applications. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Moore into that of Peart for the inclusion of a “removable” memory module. And the motivation for doing so would have been to provide associated applications (from external sources such as the server or the removable storage module) for distributed execution of certain file types residing on the computer system (see at least Peart col.2:31-40; Moore col.1:9-col.2:60).

Claim 2

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Peart further teaches wherein the application and file type associations are determined by a file name extension associated with a specific file type (see at least *filename extensions* col.20:46-60).

Claim 3

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Moore further teaches wherein the computer software routine determines the priority of associating an application and file type in the virtual table by giving first priority to any application installed after insertion of the removable memory module (see at least *mappings, updated, new application program* col.22:35-43; 162, 158 FIG.8B & associated text; 122 FIG.8A & associated text).

Claim 4

The rejection of base claim 3 is incorporated. Peart further teaches wherein the computer software routine determines the priority of associating an application and file type in the virtual table by giving second priority to any application installed on recently connected removable memory modules with the more recently installed module given higher priority over subsequently installed memory modules (see at least 162, 158 FIG.8B & associated text; 122 FIG.8A & associated text; *privilege* col.24:17-col.25:9).

Claim 5

Peart teaches a portable handheld computer (see at least *portable storage media, mappings, client node* col.23:13-39) comprising the elements recited in claim 1, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 1.

Art Unit: 2192

Claims 6-11

Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claims 1-4, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claims 1-4.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chrystine Pham whose telephone number is 571-272-3702. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2192

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER